

Appn. No.: 10/812,114
Amendment Dated April 9, 2008
Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2008

MATP-650US

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 2. This sheet replaces the original sheet.

Attachment

Remarks/Arguments:

The specification was objected to as including informalities. The specification has been amended as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, it is no longer subject to objection.

The drawings were objected to as not including a reference number. Drawing Figure 2 has been amended to include this reference number. Accordingly, the drawings are no longer subject to rejection.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 15-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Blanchard. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

With regard to claim 1, Blanchard does not disclose or suggest,

... transitioning the device circuitry within the electronic device
from the powered down state to the powered up state
while remaining in the low power mode responsive to the
process message signal ... (Emphasis added).

Basis for this amendment may be found in paragraph [0190].

Applicant's exemplary embodiment includes message circuitry 202, interface circuitry 204 and device circuitry 206. Applicant's exemplary embodiment also includes a full power mode and a low power mode. In the full power mode, the device circuitry 206 is in a powered up state. In the low power mode, however, the device circuitry may transition **from the powered down state to the powered up state while remaining in the low power mode**. That is, the electronic device 104 operates in three states: (1) full power mode-powered up state, (2) low-power mode-powered up state and (3) low power mode-powered down state. Data is processed by device circuitry 206 during the powered-up state (states (1) and (2)). The powered up states refer to states when one or more components of the device circuitry 206 are in a processing state capable of processing the system messages. (Para. [0020]). The full power mode refers to power of the electronic device 104, and not just the processing capability of the device circuitry 206. (Para. [0021]).

In contrast, Blanchard discloses only two states, which include an active mode and a standby mode. (Para. [0023]). During the active mode, main power supply 230 provides

power to main circuitry 240 and receiving element 210. (Para. [0025] and [0038]). During the standby mode, main power supply 230 provides power only to receiving element 210. (Para. [0026] and [0034]). Upon receiving an activation signal, the set-top box may switch from active mode to standby mode. (Para. [0028] and [0035]). Thus, Blanchard does not disclose or suggest "...transitioning the device circuitry within the electronic device **from the powered down state to the powered up state while remaining in the low power mode** responsive to the process message signal," as recited in claim 1. Applicant's claimed features are advantageous over the prior art because power is conserved when the messages are processed in the low power mode-powered up state.

Because Blanchard does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Blanchard. Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-5 and 7 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Blanchard.

With regard to claims 8 and 17, these claims, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claims 8 and 17 are also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 9-12 and 15-16 depend from claim 8. Claims 18-21 and 23 depend from claim 17. Accordingly, claims 18-21 and 23 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Blanchard.

Claims 6, 13-14 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Blanchard and Jerding et al. Blanchard is described above. Jerding et al. does not disclose any power modes or states within power modes. Thus, Jerding et al. also does not disclose "...transitioning the device circuitry within the electronic device **from the powered down state to the powered up state while remaining in the low power mode** responsive to the process message signal," as recited in proposed claim 1.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1, claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 8 and claim 22 depends from claim 17. Accordingly, 13-14 and 22 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Blanchard and Jerding et al.

Appln. No.: 10/812,114
Amendment Dated April 9, 2008
Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2008

MATP-650US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections to the specification and drawings and the rejection of claims 1-23.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney for Applicant

KNN/DFD/snp/pbm

Dated: April 9, 2008

SNP_H:\NRPORTBL\RP\\$NPEREZ\270452_1.DOC